

Student Faculty Task Force

Taskforce members:

Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Sandy Johnson, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Sarah Knox, Antara Rao, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, Srikantan Nagarajan, Nadia Ayad, Jason Gestwicki, Douglass Wassarman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, Tejal Desai, Chase Webb, Jasmine King, D'Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, Nicole Foti

July 20, 2020

Agenda

1. Introductions

Who you are + short (1-2 sentences) of your goals for the taskforce

2. Discussion of the Summary of major DEI points document

Power point presentation (Attached) of an annotated version of the Summary of Major points in DEI plans.

Discussion will focus on whether there is general consensus, whether we can build in cross program and program/grad division efforts, and whether others need more extensive discussion of merit.

3. Next Steps

MEETING MINUTES (**Meeting recorded for note taking purposes*)

Attendees:

Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Sarah Knox, Antara Rao, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, Jason Gestwicki, Douglass Wassarman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, D'Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, Sandy Johnson, Nicole Foti, Srikantan Nagarajan, Jasmine King, Chase Webb, Tejal Desai, Jennifer Thompson (note taker)

Key issues raised in introductions as goals for taskforce:

- . Learn from others & come up with a uniform set of guidelines around DEI to increase transparency & accountability across all Grad Programs and make UCSF a more welcoming place for all students, especially minoritized students
- . Build in accountability & sustainability to the changes we aim to make
- . Create better avenues to recognize & amplify students' voices & ensure their efforts aren't in vain
- . Compensate students for DEI leadership
- . Standardize & make admissions processes more equitable
- . Increase enrollment of black students; form coalitions and collaborations to come up with action items to improve experience for black students and black faculty at UCSF
- . Gain an understanding of the current landscape; what's being done to increase efforts to address anti-black racism & how black students are integrated into that process
- . ID issues where we can speak with one voice to leverage all programs to effect leadership on issues that we cannot solve by ourselves
- . In addition to short-term plans & actions; develop medium and long-term plans that mobilize resources to address racism and anti-blackness on campus

- . Ensure that any changes in this space are implemented at all levels of UCSF – encompassing staff/faculty as well as students
- . Increase faculty engagement & training around these issues
- . Collaboratively make a difference, so that in the near future the experience of a black trainee is exactly identical to that of a white trainee
- . Understand how those of us in the majority demographic can lighten the burden on our URM colleagues by IDing opportunities to become more involved in doing this work
- . Get up to speed with what has been done so far in this space, and as a faculty member, learn how to lift some of the burden of this work from students
- . Bridge disconnect between efforts of students and grad programs vs. institutional leadership in embracing cultural shift through actions. Lend my voice figure out how to muster resources that will enable us to move from talk to action by changing the uppermost culture; to then influence everything else
- . Synergize efforts between work of grad div and grad programs

Brief discussion to clarify end goal of meeting

End goal is to come up with a document or list that can be used to show what grad programs are committed to, and to lay out the landscape, to inform anyone who is going to work with us. To get there, we need to identify commonalities, and any differences, and assess what is working vs. what is not. Some things are in progress and some things are in the planning stage. The PPT is derived primarily from BMI's DEI plan, which is the most comprehensive and advanced & provides a snapshot as a starting point.

Discussion of PPT – (an annotated version of the Summary of Major points in DEI plans)

Key issues raised re: yearly DEI trainings for faculty

- . re: BMI DEI plan: to date, very little has been implemented or tracked in data driven way, so there is no numerical sense of what is and isn't working
- . Consensus that DEI trainings for faculty should be mandatory; but which ones?
- . Consensus that there has been little accountability for faculty to attend training. Mechanisms needed for holding faculty accountable (**more on this below**)
- . Trainings need to be viewed as a starting point for an evolution of true commitment and engagement in these activities that emphasizes direct action
- . Mandate that DEI be part of RCR (*D'Anne is developing anti-black racism content for next year's sessions)

Champion Training

- . Concern raised as to whether Champion Training has a built-in mechanism to ensure faculty engagement, so that they cannot simply tune out, then 'check a box that they've fulfilled req.'
 - o Per CG, in-person iteration of training was very interactive; Dr. Guy is working on re-imaging it for Zoom; and CG is confident that she would welcome our input
- . Champion Training (in its most recent iteration) offers up very little on what actual changes we can make vis-à-vis anti-black racism
 - o DD is working with Dr. Michelle Guy to incorporate an anti-black racism component as well as other issues of particular relevance to basic sci. faculty into Champion Training

Restorative Justice

- . Overall, 1st yr. BMI students who underwent RJ training were very receptive; their collective feedback highlighted the importance of holding the Community Circles at the beginning of the year to head off issues before they unfold. Many taskforce members were not familiar with these offerings so Ryan & D'Anne provided a brief overview. Key components of the circles include enhancing dialog and vulnerability with the intent of fostering agreements to bolster community within programs; and so that ultimately folks are more comfortable with having the

conversations that need to take place when harm is done in our community. For more info see <https://studentlife.ucsf.edu/RJP>

- . A plan to roll out these RJ circles to 1st yr. students in all the grad programs is in the works
- . Interest was expressed in broadening these activities beyond 1st yr. students, to which D'Anne noted a lack of staff resources; given the need for 1-3 trained facilitators per circle; as well as, ideally, targeted curriculums for each program.
- . See emails from Liz Silva encouraging grad program directors/administrators to continue on with RJ work so that it is not a one-time deal.
 - o Community Circles have been scheduled and confirmed w/ea. basic sci programs and will take place between Aug. 28 and Sept. 14
- . Coordinated support across grad programs, fueled by the enthusiasm evident in this meeting for the grad div's RJ initiative, exemplifies the kind of synergy that can come out of this committee

Other Avenues for educating ourselves on the origins and manifestations of white privilege/systemic racism

DEI Sessions@ retreats

- . "Mandatory" DEI sessions at retreats have not worked
 - o Several students observed that whenever DEI comes up at retreats, faculty leave the room; frequently its the same group of people who are truly engaged in these activities
 - o Students would like to understand what is so difficult about making mandatory trainings work – why the disconnect?
 - o Clearly the messaging needs to change to increase awareness among both retreat organizers and attendees that participation is mandatory, not optional and that these sessions have been carefully crafted to augment other trainings vs. presenting information that is redundant
 - o A cultural shift is necessary to elevate DEI as an integral part of retreat programs on par with skits, rather than an add-on, afterthought, or obligation

Other Challenges

- . Who is in charge of coming up with acceptable DEI trainings?
 - o Some led by students/staff are not up to par
 - o The DEI component of Tetrad's retreat was spearheaded by students. The content of what was discussed in break-out sessions varied widely and was often way off-point
 - o Clearly it's problematic to promote these activities then let the burden of taking initiative fall on the students

Seminar speakers on racism & research & systemic racism (for faculty)

- . Plug for more BIPOC seminar speakers to nucleate discussions. This could be accomplished if programs pooled their resources

Faculty (or student) led DEI book or journal club to educate majority on white privilege and structural racism

- . CG clarified that this would primarily be aimed at & led by non-URM faculty/students
- . A Plug to seek out books written by black scholars (ie. don't limit yourself to White Fragility)

Dealing with faculty/student issues; inappropriate behavior etc.

Carrot vs. Stick. Problem: Incentivizing faculty to attend trainings/align behavior with DEI values, has not always worked. Transparent & clear mechanisms needed to hold faculty accountable for transgressions of Title VI and community DEI values

Potential Mechanisms

Transparency

- . Every grad program website will list what trainings/DEI activities faculty have engaged in below bio

Financial punishment? –

- . Tie DEI track record to obtaining 10 yr.?
 - o For the benefit of in-coming students, advocate for transparency at the UCSF or UC-wide level around the university's expectation that demonstrated involvement in DEI trainings and efforts is not only mandatory, but a requirement for advancement to 10-yr
 - o Noted that this needs to be looked at by University-wide committee & is above power that individual grad programs wield
 - o 10-yr. is a one-time event & many faculty don't come up for it for years; may not be most effective tool. DEI mandates need to be continually enforced from day 1
- . Departments Chairs, not programs have prerogative of financial punishment

Remove non-compliant faculty from program

- . Grad programs hold the power of deciding which faculty can mentor their students, and should leverage it; including swiftly removing faculty from a program & preventing them from taking new students, when faculty are in violation of mandated DEI trainings, etc. There is precedent for this!
 - o Having students is a privilege, not a right; and that privilege comes with a responsibility to value all students through demonstrated involvement in DEI activities. A cultural shift is needed to nail home this message
 - o It's critical to immediately message out to all programs when a faculty member is removed from a given program for failure to comply with DEI mandates, so that all programs the faculty is associated with can follow suit
 - o One consideration is ensuring this is done in a manner that is not detrimental to other trainees. Caveat that while you can kick faculty out of programs, they may still create a toxic lab environment for PDs, other trainees and staff

Enhancing DEI support on Campus

Discussion centered on amplifying D'Anne's efforts & shifting burden from students

- . D'Anne is the only person supporting students of color and while there has been a positive sea change since D'Anne was hired, she is but ONE person; it's a travesty that instead of uplifting her and providing her a support team, all DEI initiatives are routed to her and the onus of implementing them falls on her shoulders.
 - o Wide consensus that we need to leverage our collective clout to find resources for D'Anne to move her vision forward at a pace that best suits her
 - o Money is there – we need to come up with action plans to prioritize how we use it
 - o We need to address siloed nature of DEI advocacy at UCSF. How can we leverage funds from across UCSF research entities to unify our efforts?
 - o Perspective from 35+ yrs. at UCSF: University leadership will be on board if efforts are voluntary but is not supportive of grassroots efforts that take money
 - o There's a glaring disconnect between UCSF's rhetoric around the importance of DEI and the lack of resources it earmarks for these efforts
- . URMs tapped or taking initiative to help educate the masses at UCSF around DEI issues should be acknowledged for their invisible labor with compensation (tuition credit/expanding existing leadership/mentoring awards to students)
 - o In order to eliminate power dynamics, support for BIPOC students needs to be guaranteed; one costly initiative would be multi-year a fellowship that can be taken to any lab

3. Meeting outcome & next steps

- 1.) Todd N. & Carol G. volunteered to work on a “Master Doc” enumerating taskforce’s vision of best practices & outlining what is the minimum each faculty would need to do vis-à-vis DEI
 - Google Doc will be set up so that all can contribute
 - Once doc is complete, taskforce 2 will meet to ensure that we’re all on board before the Doc gets disseminated to all of the grad programs
 - 2.) One output from this committee should be a request for \$ from the university
-

August 25, 2020

MEETING MINUTES

Attendees:

Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Sarah Knox, Antara Rao, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, Jason Gestwicki, Douglass Wassarman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, D’Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, Srikantan Nagarajan, Jasmine King, Chase Webb, Tejal Desai, Jennifer Thompson, Alexander Johnson, Christina Stephens, Nicole Foti

Carol G. shared three slides that summarize (although not comprehensively, missing certain pieces) the new DEI plan – Google doc put created by Todd N. after last meeting.

Slide 1

Taskforce #2: Meeting 2
Goal: Identify commonalities and distinctions across DEI plans

TRAINING

1. Training for faculty: 1 course/yr, starting with DEI Champions
2. Training for students
 - A. Yr 1: Training at retreat + restorative justice + new course + RCR
 - B. Yr 3: PhD reorientation
 - C. DEI leadership course: competitive admission
3. Topics for discussion
 - A. Timing of new student course

Discussion on Slide 1: Training

Restorative Justice Circles:

- Restorative justice has multiple levels; level one is community building, so that's what would happen in Yr 1 training for students
- Recommend that faculty also take part in restorative justice circles, to address trust issue between students and faculty
 - Agreement by others, current limiting factor is staff capacity; it takes multiple staff to facilitate circles
- Idea: add restorative circles in third year orientation in the next couple years for the students who would miss first year training
- Nothing but positive feedback from restorative justice circles

DEI champions training:

- On their website, still no mention of specifically anti-black racism as of now
 - It was mentioned by Michelle (DEI champions trainer) that she will incorporate this, not clear when

New antiracism in science course for students:

- Response to concern that students have too much going on in their first year to take diversity and racism in science course: we need to move things around if there's too much on their plate; first year is when a lot of harm happens and so this should be prioritized early on

Slide 2

NEW EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

1. Book clubs/journal clubs on literature of racism
2. Seminar programs:
 - a. more diverse speakers with BIPOC speakers staying for 2 days
 - b. 1 seminar/yr featuring a speaker who studies or teaches racism
3. Incorporate diversity events into retreats with required attendance
4. Questions for discussion:
 - a. Will all grad programs commit to these actions?
 - b. How to incorporate work of Gilliam Fellows
 - c. Strategies to use retreat events to increase faculty/grad program engagement

Discussion on Slide 2: New Events and Activities

- We should make sure we're not overlapping too much and utilizing resources across schools, e.g. the School of Dentistry is recruiting faculty members of color to give seminars
 - Cross-pollinating, integration across the school is needed and needs to go to Dean's level; continued siloes reproduce racist practices
- It's more than just having a seminar once every quarter or year, needs to be more engaging, more than 1hr lecture; need to offer tools and practices faculty can take away and use; something like the LGTB health forum or half day
- One thing they've done in [missed program or dept – Aparna L.] is to bring in an expert speaker on antiracism or law enforcement, and then later coming together as a community to discuss it
- We have money for speakers, so how can we make this sustainable? Is there a committee to help/formalize a selection process for BIPOC speakers?
 - Recommendation: Black in STEM, 500 Queer Scientist, 500 Women Scientist have been doing visibility campaigns and have curated lists of leaders that could potentially be speakers
 - PSPG are getting speakers that experts in racism, independent of the science speakers series
- Since there is an aspect of emotional labor here, they should be paid more
 - For the Biochem series, that is the plan
- Also need to keep in mind that scientists from historically marginalized background might want to just talk about their science, not other experiences, or is that an expectation imposed on them?
 - Biochem has two people working on these exact questions
- Two forms of speakers
- -One is to have explicit experts to teach on racism, and also to have BIPOC scientist speakers talk about their science (importance of seeing people who look like you) as well as encouraging the option to share their experiences of racism in science
- Thing that ties DEI staff and seminar series; faculty need to pressure institution to hire staff to help D'Anne, we should not leave it for D'Anne to advocate for herself
 - If UCSF agrees anti-racism training is important (response to limitations around staff capacity), then UCSF should invest money to increase capacity
 - There is siloing in the institution, need to make better use of resources; there are DEI representatives at other places within the school
 - A lot of initiatives being built in programs are really going off developments at Grad Division
- Reliance on ORU are philanthropic funds and might not be the best financial support to rely on sustainably
 - How do we talk with philanthropic funders to fund diversity efforts?
 - Development Office is the place to push these initiatives forward
 - Tejal just did a presentation to advocate for students and philanthropic funding, will share this presentation with the committee
 - Any one of these big funders who pay for building could easily fund these effort
 - Students can be a huge help in getting funders to support students
 - Faculty should be more conscientious about asking for students as the first line of labor; faculty should do this work first before asking students
- Students from marginalized background whose mission is to be here to advance science and not diversity and equity work should not be expected to do that work
 - Need to pay students - this cannot be in the form of giftcards; students cannot pay their rent with giftcards

- All programs right now have mechanisms to pay students now, and programs are using these funds; this is an idea/option to pay students now, while we work to develop more sustainable funding mechanisms; need mechanism now as well as sustainable mechanism
- One thing to add to the conversation is to discuss elitism and the coded racist messaging in elitism; what is elitism? What is meritocracy? What is expected of students of who we include in our club?
 - This needs to be unpacked; Assimilation is a tool for racism

Slide 3

NEW POLICIES TO ENSURE ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Graduate programs will develop guidelines for admission to program
 - a. Faculty must comply with requirement for mentor training
 - b. faculty who have been sanctioned under Title 9 or Title 7 will be denied access to graduate students by graduate programs
2. Develop and publish on the program website the intervention strategies Used to deal with problematic interactions
3. Develop a Faculty Code of Conduct adopted by all programs, which articulates requirements for membership
4. Yearly program climate surveys (anonymous?) followed by meetings with students
5. Yearly meetings between grad program directors and Dean Watkins: connections to students??

Discussion on Slide 3: New Policies to Ensure Accountability

- What is the mechanism for holding faculty accountable? Faculty code of conduct is not adhered to
- Handway if not in the Academic Senate bylaws, no enforcement mechanism
- There is some enforcement through graduate programs
 - This does not count for postdocs
 - Bare minimum is for these faculty to not have students; but also need to go up against faculty from graduate counsel; some barriers have been lofled by faculty in terms of lawsuits, but school should have more courage to go up against faculty who violate policies
- Enforcement has to happen above grad programs as well; too many conflicts of interest with faculty in programs; there has to be a standardized policy across Grad Division
- How can we engage values of restorative justice vs punitive measures to ensure accountability?
 - If a faculty member is found in violation, is there a mechanism for them to repair the harm and reintegrate back into our communities; code of conduct should have statements on this

- There are systems in place for Title 9 violations, there's OMBUDS; But there are systems of protection for faculty; the level at which it is handled causes issues
 - Faculty are still unable to find out what violations were found about other faculty members
 - Freedom of information act, could go this route
 - Shouldn't be this huge of a burden to find this information out
 - At graduate counsel this was brought up, a couple mechanisms were discussed, where some amount of people could get information on violations
- The faculty code of conduct, could we have faculty sign this on annual basis
 - Unclear how "new" code of conduct would be different
 - Idea: we could go through and add language, such as explicit language against structural racism
 - We should have these values across the university, not just grad div faculty
 - Agreed, but where we have control is over graduate programs
 - Power of code of conduct, in addition to APM, on every individual program website that is it will be transparent; no one can gaslight you and say these things aren't important or required of faculty

Next Steps:

- Task force members will review and clean up DEI Initiatives document by the end of the week
- This document will be sent out next week to program directors
 - Programs will be asked to review, make edits, and ensure that plan can/will be implemented
 - Programs to clarify who will carry the changes (make clear it is not always students, as this is not clear)
- Think about faculty code of conduct across grad programs
 - Will need to come to decision about consequences – put some thought into this (outright dismissal from program, restorative justice, etc.) for next meeting

October 6, 2020

Attendees: Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, Jason Gestwicki, Douglass Wassarman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, D'Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, , Sandy Johnson, Srikantan Nagarajan, Jasmine King, Tejal Desai, Erin Johnson, Jennifer Thompson (note taker)

Moderators: *D'Anne Duncan & Elizabeth McCarthy*

Agenda:

The over-arching agenda for this mtg. is for students to share broader themes & points of concern to enable success of the final "document" that is the end goal of taskforce 2.

Setting the context

Robbie Diaz reminded us that the public execution of George Floyd was the the initial impetus for this TF; underscored that 19 additional black lives that have been taken at the hands of police since the Student-Faculty Diversity Committee's last meeting in June, & noted the potentially re-traumatizing nature of topics of discussion. He reiterated that, taskforce engagement is work, additional work, and that the educational status of our black students does not protect them from the emotionally traumatizing nature of this taskforce work. Finally, he urged any and all to take the space, if they needed it, to deal with any emotions arising out of our discussion.

The slide deck collectively developed by the students of TF2 and presented by Robbie, Doug, Anna provides not only an overview of the TF document as it currently stands, but a thorough and thoughtful critique that summarizes broader themes and pinpoints the students' concerns vis-à-vis both the document and the current culture of DEI work within the taskforces; and, more broadly, within UCSF as an institution.

Since the slide deck is invaluable for framing the discussion notes captured below; we will ensure that all TF 2 members receive a copy. The students went a step further than outlining concerns in their presentation; in multiple instances they put forth suggestions to address their concerns which are the bolded bullet points under the sub-theme categories.

The students' identified 3 broad categories of discussion topics. To mirror the gist of their framework I've done my best to map the largely anonymized & paraphrased discussion comments and outcomes to the most relevant topics.

Task Force Document: w/in this theme discussion centered largely around several broad and specific concerns:

The frustration generated by the lack of clarity vis-à-vis who is accountable for what

Specific concern: the heavy lifting is falling to D'Anne and the students, **and will continue to**, until ownership & responsibility for initiatives is clarified.

Specific concern: We need to parse out short term vs. long term initiatives and come to an agreed upon timeline for implementation

Discussion:

- Concern that document is not at an end stage
- the merit of identifying and distilling from the current document those items that could be implemented within a short timeframe without further extensive discussion
 - o It was noted that some programs have already implemented some action items (which may provide a template for other programs) and also that some items have implications for incoming students
 - o Faculty wanted to understand whether we had consensus points that we could move forward with in the short-term
 - Discussion ensued on how to gauge TF consensus & the need to qualify language for any undefined terms used in doc.
 - 2/3 majority vs. unanimity – put more weight on student assessments? Is it premature to develop working def of consensus?

- Erin Johnson, a new Rosenberg Fellow working with D'Anne will work on developing metrics to enable us to measure points of consensus w/in our existing doc & ensure that language is not watered down. D'Anne will pull from her internal glossary re: undefined terms
- o Erin is in the process of packaging our current document in a form that delineates what is already in progress/who is responsible for what/ & assigning a comprehensive timeline for implementation of the various initiatives; it will be disseminated to the group for comment at least a week in advance of our next meeting
 - Anonymize assessments? Sort by faculty vs. students?
 - Make it a living doc w/ caveats reflected in footnotes, that get revisited? Need mechanism to ensure that dissenting ideas don't get lost

Agenda item at our next mtg: - Discuss & vote on latest iteration of the "document"

- Re: Accountability & trainings, RH reported that he working with Isaac & Jason G. to try & come up with an enforcement mechanism for DEI trainings that we will share at an upcoming meeting

Management and Organization Concerns: w/in this theme discussion largely centered on concerns around lack of clarity re: the goals and structure of the TF as well as expectations of TF members at all levels; and the sustainability of DEI work.

Concern: The lack of financial compensation for students engaged in DEI work was brought up: Students noted that this work detracts from their thesis work and is not considered as part of their progress to degree completion.

- o DEI work could be formally included in student theses, which could be beneficial to a host of folks already engaged in this work. Some universities have already made this a requirement
 - **This idea merits further consideration by the TF**

Concern: Lack of full-time experts demonstrates a lack of commitment on behalf of Grad Div.

- o Concerns about bandwidth of D'Anne & other individuals working on DEI
- o Sandy offered to spearhead an effort to approach Basic Sci. Chairs at their next mtg. to enlist them in making it a priority to ask for money for this work (leverage their visibility w/ institutional purse holders)
- o Tejal has been talking w/ Michael Penn about a similar effort
- o Robbie noted that a previous effort to target faculty on Training Grants & HHMI faculty with discretionary funds for an annual contribution to support student groups engaged in DEI work went nowhere

Future TF agenda item: Strategize a coordinated approach to prime Basic Science Chairs for a future ask for \$ to sustain DEI efforts

Concern: No clarity around goals & structure of TF

Substantial discussion re: re-structuring TF, forming sub-groups for specific tasks & defining goals/what is success?

- o Ea. Sub-group would need a manager (ie. a D'Anne) to create deliverables
- o Effectiveness of sub-groups can go either way
- o If we adopt sub-groups; onus should be on faculty
- o Step-back & re-examine broader structure/define concrete goals/metrics of success? – this could be delegated to a 1st sub-group
- o CG wants to learn from students – what would you see as your role on sub-committees, if we move towards that structure?
 - For funding sub-committee students could be a bridge to help pinpoint & articulate what activities/student groups need funding

- For curriculum or admissions student role could be identifying inclusive language and theories
- For outreach, student input can shape the success of our efforts
- As students, we can comment on our lived experiences; but it's hard for us to make broad spectrum claims for our entire community -that is where we need to seek out, recruit and rely on experts, beyond D'Anne
- o Do we want this TF to deal w/ long-term issues or go back to SFDC; perhaps restructure that group to have them tackle some of the long-term issues? Note – there is quite a bit of overlap in the composition of the 2 groups
- o Or, Would students like to wrap up initial work of TF & tease out longer term action items? – or re-constitute TF with new structure?
- o Can we clarify over-arching & concrete goals of TFs & their relation to Student-Faculty Diversity Comm. – who is ultimately responsible for writing faculty code of conduct? (as FYI several Basic Sci programs already have templates for Faculty Code of Conduct
- o Can we define what we mean by short-term?
- o Faculty want to know where to focus their energy
- o From a theory of group development perspective, seems like we're nearing the performing stage; therefore reconstituting the group might be a step backwards

Future TF agenda item: Further refine goals/structure of TF; expectations of its members (faculty vs. students); as well as its relationship to the Student-Faculty Diversity Committee

Concern: Sense of Urgency/Disconnect (w/o addressing concerns and feedback)

- o Students expressed concern that the sense of **Urgency** with which the TF has attempted to complete this deliverable, has trumped addressing their concerns and feedback
- o Several faculty brought up fear of losing required TF momentum & urgency; and expressed a desire to hear from students re: both where they might best focus their energy; and how to better understand harm/risks of rapid implementation.

Robbie re: risks of rapid implementation:

- Even “easily” implemented actions including inviting seminar speakers from diverse backgrounds can do harm, if not delicately executed (ie. may result in tokenism)
- To lower risk of harm along racial identities, the only initiatives that could be implemented w/in 3-6 mos. are those drawing on existing content & aimed at faculty, and, that would be beneficial to students
- Anything involving student interface/experience represents way bigger endeavor with more potential for harm that is a huge stretch for this admissions cycle
- After hearing comments; Robbie would like explicit moratorium on implementing any changes until next Fall; this could enable us to promote current efforts while preventing further harm
 - o Carol pointed out that there is significant overlap between membership of this TF2 and the Student-Faculty Diversity Committee. She initially set up TFs as an emergency measure to address concerns that came out of last SFDC mtg. The immediate objective was for the TFs to assess/communicate what is currently out there re: DEI in Grad Div & Grad programs. These were short-term initiatives that would report back to SFDC. CG wanted to get back quickly to program directors quickly w set of guidelines to vote on; then have programs monitor each other re: actions implemented and conduct a post evaluation @ 1 yr.
 - Need for clarity around what this group does, what individual programs do and what grad div does, there are many simultaneous efforts; sense that

we are being diffuse which adds to feeling that nothing is getting done.
One of strengths of TF is that it has representation from all the programs
– how do we intersect with other ongoing efforts?

Student Support and Expectations: w/in this theme discussion largely centered on the following concerns:

Concern: Students' perspectives and emotions are not respected

- o Students feel we have to monitor our tone
- o Voices must not only be heard, but valued and honored
- o There is a common assumption that students will implement changes; regardless of whether they've given their explicit approval).
- o Students shouldn't be seen as experts on these topics
- o Be mindful of not piling more responsibilities on students

Concern: There is a lack of engagement in discussion about points of contention and confusion

- o It is commonplace for points of contention/confusion to be truncated or side-lined
- o Discussions focus on why we can't do something, not how we can change things
- o One student having an issue is enough to merit discussion on that point

Concern: There is an assumption that students will implement changes; regardless of whether they've given their explicit approval

- o This is both commonplace and damaging
- o Prioritize explicit approval from students
- o Outline expectations of roles of faculty vs. students

Outcomes - Next Steps: See Agenda items highlighted in red above

Next Meeting: We aim to have our next meeting the week of Nov. 16. Ideally we'll send out mtg. materials a week ahead to allow for initial comments before voting

- **Wanted:** 2 student & 2 faculty reps to meet with D'Anne to collaboratively make a PPT & agenda for next meeting. **Email D'Anne to volunteer**

Taskforce 2 Meeting Notes November 17, 2020

Attendees: Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, ~~Jason Gestwicki~~, Douglass Wassarman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, D'Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, Sandy Johnson, Sarah Knox, Srikantan Nagarajan, Jasmine King, Tejal Desai, ~~Antra Rao~~, Erin Johnson

moderator: D'Anne Duncan | paraphraser/note taker: Jennifer Thompson

Agenda:

Brief Updates – 5 min (D'Anne Duncan)

- TF1 – has been dissolved; going forward there is just one TF
- Re: hiring a Diversity Outreach Program Manager, progress has been made, 1st Round of interviews (3 of 6) took place today.

Task Force Prioritization Survey Results – 60+ min (D'Anne Duncan and Erin Johnson)

Task Force Next Steps and Meeting Date – 30 min (all Task Force Members)

Attached Documents:

Task Force Prioritization Results, which will be presented during this meeting

Task Force Prioritization Survey (for your reference)

Task Force Prioritization Survey Results: (D'Anne Duncan and Erin Johnson)

Methods overview & General Questions

- Survey, based on table summarizing 2 TF documents, was sent out to group following our last meeting & was open for comment for 2 weeks; with the ultimate goal of steering us towards a shared understanding of our priorities Re: what needs to happen next.
- Initiatives either completed or nearly completed, were not assigned urgency scale
- Erin's Methods Overview slide summarized how the remaining initiatives were treated
- Ultimately, N=14 with 8 faculty & 5 student respondents from 7 programs. Among initiatives where there was agreement in prioritization by both faculty and students; 7 initiatives were rated as critical, 1 as high, 0 as medium & 2 as low.
- 9 remaining initiatives require discussion to flush out, clarify understanding, & prioritize
- Approx. 45% of student TF members & 61% of faculty TF members responded
- After viewing survey results, multiple faculty agreed with a suggestion to defer to the student responses; noting that in many instances they were trying to guess what students would prioritize. Now that they see what's most important to students, they would likely change their answers.

Review & discussion of 9 slides, point by point

Row 8 – Goal: Celebrate diversity on campus. Program or Initiative: Annual named speaker slot for BIPOC & LBGTQ speakers* much of discussion also relevant to Row 9

Discussion centered largely around the pros and cons of diversifying our current seminar series vs. creating a parallel series of diverse speakers. Ultimately there was widespread agreement ***that we should work towards diversification of our existing seminar series in all programs/schools via guidelines that would underscore our commitment to have all speakers be diverse***

Methodology & implementation

- **Develop timeline & goal to establish metrics in order to measure progress**
 - Goal could be based on state or national demographics with a set timeline to reach that level of representation vs. establishing an artificial %
 - We could create benchmarks that programs need to hit in order to continue accessing funds from Grad Div, etc. that support seminar series
 - Retain well-compensated named speaker slots for BIPOC/LGBT speakers in tandem with diversifying entire speaker series
- **Incentivize programs to implement TF suggestion**
- **Include student representatives on seminar speaker committees and increase the number of slots in seminar series invited by students**
 - Make the whole process more transparent vs. cherry-picking a few students to participate; have measures to significantly broaden pool of invitees to guard against it becoming an insiders club that maintains the status quo
 - speakers are much more likely to come when invited by students vs. faculty
 - Concern about placing onus on students to diversify speaker line-up; flip-side is that it is a tremendous opportunity welcomed by many students
 - This is already being done in the SOD and Biochemistry
 - Databases & curated lists of diverse speakers already exist – some programs have already taken the initiative to diversity invited speakers (outside of TF); SOD/Biochemistry

Cons expressed vis-à-vis Grad Div. creating a separate bi-annual named speaker slot

- A “separate but equal” seminar series – falls into slippery slope of tokenism

- Feels like a good publicity move that will not have much of a structural impact on students, and that glosses over the most important step of making the campus less white & less male

Summary of action items: #1a) First work towards diversification of existing seminar series; 1b) Address issues of transparency/logistics/who's inviting who 1c) Benchmarks: how do we achieve our goal of sustainability? (Then) #2) Create a bi-annual seminar series per original initiative; could be separate – but that has its issues

Row 16 – Goal: Promote equity and inclusion in programs. Program or initiative: Application review policy

The upshot of the discussion from the faculty's POV was that likely they didn't prioritize this because for multiple programs it's already "baked into the process." -Tetrad/BMS/BioE/Biophysics. Students underscored the need for more standardization across programs and more granulation re: what is a URM.

The following concerns were raised (mostly by faculty):

- Improve communication to faculty to encourage them to participate in outreach opportunities, and underscore its importance
- Prioritize improving climate/retention; otherwise, why do outreach?
- Care in wording of any best practices, due to potential backlash, given defeat of Prop 16
- Recognize the value in having each program come up with best practices to "export" – some programs have been early adopters and extremely innovative
- Recognize the prevalence of biases in process/have strong people on committees to call others out vs. relying on rubrics
 - o As one outcome of this TF, provide a list of potential biases for admissions committees to reference? & Get it into hands of the advocate?
 - o Recognize the value of student representation on admissions committees to ID and call out biases that faculty may miss
 - o Mirror UCB's model, by having a representative from diversity office on committees to champion/advocate for BIPOC applicants
 - DD has been advocating this since she was hired & hopes this will be one of the outcomes of the holistic admissions review; could be a trained faculty or professional staff member
- Recognize that "survivor bias" is a huge problem/challenge in our admissions analysis; we need to pair that analysis with a review of our recruitment efforts
 - o We need to understand *why* people aren't applying; shift our focus upstream to put in much more effort before students apply – otherwise we miss the problem
 - o Students pointed out the need to recruit in people's back yards, not only at conferences, which selects for students at universities who have \$ to send them.
 - o For this very reason, from the time she joined UCSF, CG has spearheaded increasing outreach efforts & bolstering URM admissions to SRTP, as a pipeline
 - o Per student: lack of a moving stipend results in self-selecting for students with the means to relocate to SF & ultimately undermining DEI efforts, a point she's brought up repeatedly; UCSF is not competitive w/other schools in this regard
 - This very point was recently discussed at a mtg of grad program directors – TK optimistic that more programs will step up w/support

Concerns raised by students:

- One huge source of discrepancy & bias stems from variations in each program's application review process; some programs have students on their committees or provide bias training; while others don't, etc.- a standardized policy could address this
- The analysis of "URM/non-URM" candidates, and their trajectory thru the review process is problematic because it treats all "URMs" equally; yet we can't treat Black or LatinX men and woman the same & it doesn't just stop there – the student questions whether reviewers are influenced by college name recognition/perceptions of research heavy universities, SRTP, LOR names, etc. vs. being blinded to these factors.
- More granularity needed w/ respect to how we define "URM" as they don't all have the same experience navigating higher ed; additionally "URM" may miss 1st Gen status & other identities
- For programs that have started implementing these measures, when did they start & how is it working? How is "success" measured/how high is this bar? Why is there resistance to evaluating "best practices" to work toward more uniform application of these measures across all programs? Students seeing less and less Black faces in incoming cohorts year over year want to know WHY this isn't more of a priority.
- We seem to be missing a deeper demographic breakdown of URMS – evidenced by the clear lack of Black Students (also Indigenous students)
- Wanted to float the idea of making rubrics for admissions committees public
 - Sri will share BioE rubric developed for admissions committee members, aimed at enhancing diversity of final candidate pools

Summary of Action Items

- 1) Assess outreach efforts before students apply to individual programs
- 2) Add someone to admissions committees to call out biases
- 3) Streamline efforts to disseminate SRTP recs to admissions committees
- 4) Continue with GD's ongoing holistic admissions review

Row 20 – Goal: Retention of BIPOC Students. Program or initiative: Annual climate survey of students

The upshot of the discussion was that we don't need to evaluate how students feel; URM stories are not new, we have data, but we're not seeing accountability. Instead, we need to evaluate how students feel about initiatives & accountability.

Comments and concerns voiced:

- Survey perceived as more work for students + another opportunity not to be heard
- None of language in the question or survey implies any accountability; therefore such an evaluation would be meaningless
- Collapsing unique experiences into numbers makes it easier for them to be ignored
- A presenter at ABRCMS utilized a program which anonymized feedback in real-time that could be a tool/catalyst for change we could adopt

Summary of Action Items: Develop an evaluation to gauge how students feel about new programming, that is meant to improve their experiences, is important (Rows 20-21) & building accountability into all that we do.

Row 26 – Goal: University-level initiatives. Program or initiative: Develop physical space on campus for marginalized populations

The question of whether this is something Grad Div., or programs, need to re-visit & whether students will have input was raised. Several faculty members noted that they'd given this low prioritization due to a perception that it was outside the scope of the committee (ie. Dean's office, not faculty, has jurisdiction over allocating space). DD shared that Liz Watkins has been

advocating for this for years and that there are already things in the works (new space coming to MB via Office of Diversity & Outreach, Multicultural & LGBT Resource Center).

Discussion

- RD noted that he & a BMS student had some input at meetings on space planning several years ago
- Sri noted that the Parnassus Campus Revitalization project presents an opportunity to advocate for this initiative

Task Force Next Steps and Meeting Date: – 30 min (all Task Force Members)

Outcomes/next steps relevant to initiatives already discussed highlighted in red above

Due to time constraints the following items from today's agenda are pending and will be discussed & prioritized at our next meeting in December.

Programs or Initiatives:

- Discrepancies in Rows 9,18, (19?), 21 & 27)* 9 & 21 bled into today's discussion; in the interest of time, GN volunteered to have #19 tabled
- **What is the future direction of the TF & will it be more institutionalized?**

TF unanimously agreed to prioritize working towards the institutionalization of TF with goal of getting students compensated for this work

- RD questioned whether we can have confidence in the direction of this TF, given the fact that only 5 students responded to survey- this ties into need to compensate students who are engaged in DEI work
- GN & TK: Volunteered to advocate as Program Directors for compensation of students for these efforts & noted that precedence exists, though perhaps not at Grad Div. level.
 - Explore Departmental budgets?
- Dean Watkins advocated at Oct. Town Hall for compensation for students appointed at certain levels & doing DEI work; potentially this TF could fall under Dean's level
- Outstanding: re-evaluate TF goals + structure; and how TF intersects with Faculty-Student Diversity Committee
- Schedule a future discussion on feedback provided by survey participants – DD noted that this is not forgotten & will be a much longer discussion to clarify language/wording of initiatives in which there was alignment across student/faculty responses
- Agendize discussion on faculty code of conduct

Next Meeting: Our next meeting will be on December 9, from 2-4 pm; ideally we'll send out mtg. materials a week ahead to allow for initial comments before voting

**Taskforce 2 Continuation Meeting Notes
December 9, 2020**

Attendees: Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Douglass Wassarman, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, D'Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, Sandy Johnson, Sarah Knox, Srikantan Nagarajan, Jasmine King, Tejal Desai, Anatra Rao, Erin Johnson
moderator: D'Anne Duncan | **paraphraser/note taker:** Jennifer Thompson

Updates: D'Anne completed 3 finalist interviews last night for the **Diversity Outreach Program Manager position**; RD was a student interviewer for last round. Formal announcement more likely in January with a late January start date.

Compensation for TF student members (TK/GN): All grad programs are on board w/ adopting compensation based on the model that Liz Watkins has piloted for other university defined TFs for a set period of time. The students will discuss the 2 models being considered and get back to D'Anne, Geeta and Tanja by EOD on Dec. 18, 2020 with their preference. Compensation will be retroactive to July 2020, with a projected wrap date of April 1. Either every student on the TF will receive the same amount of money based on a monthly estimate of average time spent OR students will track their hours individually and be compensated accordingly. Tax implications of spreading payments over 2020/2021 to be considered. Delivery mechanism is worked out.

New TF Recommendation Prioritization Document (DD /EJ): Erin presented an overview of her new color-coded document that is organized by priority and is essentially a re-arrangement of the unwieldy Table she presented at our Nov. 17 mtg. Priority Key: **Red=critical**; **Orange=High**; **Yellow=Medium**; **Green=Low**; and **Blue=already completed or nearly complete**. The row #s reference back to the original table & link to the PPT that was presented at our 11/17/20 mtg. An expanded version of each initiative w/ relevant detail & issues of discussion start on pg. 3 (these were organized by priority, then Row#). Discussion issues were collated from both the Original Doc and the subsequent Qualtrics Survey.

- Discussion focused on 6 of the 9 initiatives prioritized as critical in this document with the aim of flushing out **What** our recommendations are; to enable TF to present them in a precise & organized manner.
- The remaining 3 items identified as critical are at the University Level & therefore may be less actionable for our TF
- **DD** Update re: *Mental Health Services*: 4 BIPOC PDs will be hired, 2 in January & up to 4 over the year. This search is already underway. This is moving in a positive direction.

Row 7 Goal: Increase DEI training for faculty. Initiative: Ongoing DEI Training

- Sri & BioE counterpart @UCB are tasked w/compiling all DEI training resources for students & faculty. They'd like to have better understanding of which trainings are deemed adequate vs. those that need updating. Cross-program training prescription would be helpful.
- Carol retreating from responsibility of following up with Michelle Guy re: updating Champions Training w/ Anti-racism/Blackness components & making it more relevant to Basic Science; Differences Matter initiative is ending & she may no longer have regular contact with those folks.
 - Per DD, Liz Silva & Isaac Strong will take up the torch with Michelle Guy. This is already underway for DEI
- In coming up with metrics for faculty it will be key to define **WHICH** trainings fulfill requirements & then incorporate all the right trainings into the compliance tracking piece that Jason & Ryan have been working on.
- Notion of introducing a **flow chart** as a guide to frequency/type & composition of whole training experience was put forth
 - flow chart could be portable among programs
 - Important to ensure that it incorporates the right trainings & indicates which are introductory vs. advanced
 - Diversity amongst trainings is also good for diversity: should we build-in flexibility re: trainings, to engage faculty by including rigorous trainings outside UCSF?
 - Some faculty need to take the same training more than 1x while others need to build on concepts grasped from previous trainings
- Essential to incorporate student feedback on content of trainings run out of Grad Div.
- All workshops will have an evaluation component to capture feedback/assess training

Action items

- F/U with Jason & Ryan to present on progress re: tracking compliance piece
- Invite Isaac to provide an overview/update of what he's been doing in this arena

Rows 12a/b & 13 - Goal: Increase faculty accountability for conduct. Programs or Initiatives: Develop Faculty Code of Conduct (FCC) TN provided an overview of GC efforts to codify key pieces of the FCC in by-laws & shared proposed language re: Faculty Membership in Graduate Groups vis-à-vis violations of title 7 or 9. He encouraged TF members to weigh-in on Google Doc before next week's GC mtg.; and made a case for TF to develop language for a FCC to be adopted at the individual grad program level, in tandem w/ the GC effort. GC effort is a complex, drawn out process that might not go far enough; both routes should be pursued.

GC Draft Doc Discussion

- **Point B** tries to codify idea that violations would result in removal (privilege not a right argument). **C/D & E** attempt to address issues of transparency & provide timeframes
 - o Point B is by far most the contentious vis-à-vis legal perspective/"including but not limited to" clause is problematic in its vagueness
 - o UC wide reporting mandates re: Title 7 & 9 violations, are potential obstacles to implementing a separate FCC drafted by the TF
 - o Long-term goal could be for Grad Council to advocate for changing mandated reporting requirements vis-à-vis sexual harassment; given that the policy was clearly written to protect the university (this may fall outside of Grad Council's purview)
- Extensive discussion re: Omission of RJ framework, or for that matter, any path towards re-entry in proposed language, making it fully punitive.
 - o This needs to be deeply considered and fully unpacked, it's a nuanced, slippery slope.
 - o Ideal compromise option could be restoring some privileges/allowing victim agency over whether they want to resort to RJ
 - o Consider interventions beyond trainings to mitigate behavior & cost/benefit analysis
- Guidelines needed for de-escalating issues that fall into Gray Areas; these are the trickiest
 - o Bias response team to be piloted in Grad Div. They'll use RJ to tackle issues falling into gray areas.

Next Steps re rows 12a/12b & 13 discussed today:

Goal – Flush out topics of discussion & complete our recommendations **by April 1.**

- After Jan. mtg. we'll re-assess whether sub-committees will be required for us to complete the work by our deadline. DD does not have bandwidth to lead subcommittees.

Action items

- Bring in experts from bias response team to flush out discussion & give us a run-down on pros & cons of RJ for resolving escalating issues. (Maria J., Elina Kosyanovskaya & Denise Caramagno); also, Dyche Mullins to advise us on our recommendations
- Remind DD to re-connect w/Jaime/Sophie/Stephen re: google doc. as a potential model for addressing/developing guidelines for gray areas
- Include a mechanism within Graduate Code of Conduct that TF develops to evaluate systematic bias/inclusivity/transparency w/in **executive committees** of individual graduate programs

Row 16:

We will table this discussion and circle back – we already have something in the works with Anna & Robbie & Liz Silva playing a role.

Row 17: Promote equity and inclusion in programs: Outreach and recruitment of BIPOC students

- CG – If we make commitment to recruit at HBCUs, let's bring in Jason Sello as our expert to help us strategize on best path forward.
- From chat: Many things need to be fixed vis-à-vis our climate before recruiting BIPOCS
- Despite high faculty enthusiasm for re-imagining SRTP to provide a virtual opportunity for the 2020 cohort, we need to revisit this point to have a larger conversation on the feasibility executing such a move: in light of the pandemic, funding issues, and staffing bandwidth
- Additionally, a larger discussion on taking a different approach is needed, probably after we bring in outside experts

Action items

- Revisit discussion on Outreach to BIPOC Students, exact timeline uncertain

Remaining Rows: 14 & 18 can be discussed internally, DD less concerned w/ rows that got medium & low priority. Remaining rows at University Level (beyond scope of TF)

Next Meeting: Our next meeting will be on January 22, from 1-3 pm; Dyche Mullins & Bias Response team members have been invited to enlighten and guide us.

**Graduate Program Taskforce 2 Continuation Meeting Notes
January 22, 2021**

Attendees: Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Douglass Wassarman, Matthew Spitzer, Tejal Desai, Anatra Rao, Dyche Mullins, Denise Caramagno, Elina Kostyanovskaya, Maria Jaochico, Chase Webb, Elizabeth McCarthy

moderator: D'Anne Duncan | **paraphraser/note taker:** Jennifer Thompson

Agenda

1. Updates/Announcements – 5 min
2. Guest Introductions – 5 min
 - **Maria Jaochico**, Director, Student Rights and Responsibilities & Restorative Justice Campus Lead @ Student Life
 - **Elina Kostyanovskaya**, UCSF Gender Equity Trainee Taskforce Lead, DSCB PhD Candidate: Co-chair of part that focuses on transparency + I am your student Title IX rep
 - **Dyche Mullins**, UCSF Graduate Council Chair, Faculty Member
3. Task Force Recommendation Discussion – 90 min

Discussion will center on Rows 12a/12b and 13 of our TF Proposal Prioritization Doc.

Updates:

- D'Anne has hired Zachary Smith who will start working with her next Monday
- Shout out to TN for success of Propel's matchmaking event earlier this week w/90+ URM PostBacc applicants resulting in approx. 750 15 min. interviews. Propel, launched this year, aims to offer research exp/ed training to URM PostBaccs. Currently propel has no funding – so goal is to facilitate "matchmaking" to get participant hired into research positions.

Rows 12a/12b – Develop/Monitor & Enforce Faculty code of Conduct + Row 13 Protocol for escalating and resolving issues (gray areas) in mentorship w/ goal to increase faculty accountability for conduct - Dyche Mullins speaking on GC efforts.

Background: Sparked by Tetrad Executive Comm. finding out about faculty violations of Title IX, only after reading about it in the paper; they decided to test the Academic Senate as an avenue to increase transparency/accountability around serious violations of FCC, in particular Title IX violations, with ultimate goal of protecting trainees.

Basically GC proposed a 5-part addition to the by-laws governing the Graduate Groups at UCSF – this has opened a can of worms which we are currently sorting through.

- I. Codifies in by-laws what is already the case: It is the heads of Grad Programs & their executive committees' that ultimately determine the criteria for membership in their respective groups.
- II. Would require Grad Groups to have perspective faculty formally acknowledge that they can be removed for serious violations of the FCC, including, but not limited to, sexual harassment/ sexual violence regulations; and, that they also acknowledge that the Chancellor is empowered to provide information about these violations to the heads of the Graduate Programs.
- III. Would require that the Chancellor then pass that info on to the Graduate Dean.
- IV. Would require the Graduate Dean to pass that info on to the Graduate Groups.
- V. Anyone found guilty of serious violations of sexual violence/harassment, or of Title VII or IX regulations, are ineligible to be members of Graduate Groups.

Current Status: After receiving input from members of a women faculty working group & the Gender Equity Training TF (GETTF) we sent it to the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee, who have not yet officially replied, though they did share their draft minutes of their meeting so that we could discuss it at our last Grad Council Mtg. The R&J committee came up with a list of different committees & stakeholders that they wanted to solicit input from.

Key Takeaways from Dyche:

- The crux of the matter is getting buy-in from Chancellor's office; outside of that, **only** the Regents or UC President can compel the Chancellors to do something.
- While shared gov is the ideal w/in UC system, there are real limitations ie. ultimately needing to get approval from UCOP.
- We're trying to eliminate speed bumps to disclosing this info + increase transparency – I want clear written feedback from Chancellor's/Title IX office etc. so that we have the barriers spelled out in black & white, which will guide us in how we tackle these issues; versus having repeated discussions about interpretations.

Questions, concerns & comments raised in discussion:

- *Are there no mechanisms to challenge the Chancellor/UC President ?*
 - o UC shared governance extends tremendous power to faculty via the Academic Senate - we can pressure Chancellor via AS/ but ultimately need buy-in.
 - o There are fundamental issues of governance and the way that money flows at UCSF that cause huge problems (clinical side doesn't have a parallel body to the Academic Senate).
 - Compare/contrast to Dignity Health model....how do we address the huge conflict of interest issue: UC branded health vs. educational side - aka Academic Senate vs. clinical side? This is a fundamental issue of governance that often dominates discussion at EC mtgs.
 - o R&J considering why graduate groups should be privileged, in terms of flow of information, over other UCSF groups that might also like this info – they need to ensure there is equity if rolling out the policy @ UC system level.
 - o Chancellor derives his power from the Regents and Academic Senate, together; not from the people he governs.
- *Have other institutions solved this issue?*

- o DM: No one in the UC system has solved this.
- o EK: Re Title IX violations, although info is public via FOIA, our repeated requests over the course of 18 months to compel the Grad Div/UCSF to provide resources to file FOIA requests pertaining to cases from 2016-2019, and to then publish said list, have been met with inertia, redacted documents (if violator is a UCSF employee, but not a faculty member), or outright denied. This ultimately contributes to “whisper networks”; and lays the FOIA burden on trainees.
- o EK: There are a ton of institutional road blocks from UCSF and, moreover, UCOP to prevent this information from being transparent. By comparison UCLA has a process by which they proactively publish letters when someone has violated Title IX, disclosing the violation. They negotiate between the survivor and the person who did harm, and then publish a statement; proactively showing that they care, and that this is the climate they’re fostering at UCLA
- *Is info for Title VII similarly available via FOIA/requestes to UC?*
 - o EK: I would assume, though I was hoping to get more clarification on this here. Title VII was significantly weakened by the Supreme Court in the 90s, making it more difficult to achieve; and watering down protections.
- *Why do we have lawyers protecting UC brand/perpetuators vs. being transparent in the interest of fostering a thriving community (where trainees don't have to file their own FOIAs)?*
 - o EK: It has to do w/ broad concerns related to university liability, and the university being unwilling to take on the risk. This also applies to concerns around student-directed vs. mandated reporting); mandated reporting can backfire, and leave the survivor with no one to talk to.
 - o DM: I’ve received 2 very different answers to question of what information ultimately gets released via FOIA.
 - After learning that UC’s legal office applies a rubric to all Title IX complaints to determine which ones they should report, and which names should be included/redacted – (that’s the list that got published in SJ Mercury News); Grad Council asked them to divulge said rubric. Citing that it was privileged communication, the legal folks denied their request.
 - Yet, according to someone I spoke with who is on both the R&J and peer review committee; per the rubric applied in the case review, the names of all faculty members in a supervisory role were actually made public.
- EK: GETTF is advocating for redundancy in chain of communications; basically there are still 2 chains where one person is telling only one other person.
- *Do we have a sense of whether there are any advocates for this in the current Chancellor’s cabinet, who might be able to help?*
 - o Concern that w/departure of Liz W. there is nobody representing GD on behalf of research students and faculty; finding a Grad Div. advocate to Chancellor’s Office will be critical.
 - o TN reiterated importance of process that GC is undertaking to make meaningful change in this area. Groundswell support of various stakeholders demonstrating a desire to adopt and implement these changes will be key to ultimately garnering the critical support from the CO. “Happy to continue being bridge between TF & GC”
- Several comments in chat underscoring how mindblowing it is that it’s so difficult to make even incremental changes.

Action item – coordinate with as many groups as possible to build momentum on our efforts

Elina Kostyanovskaya, UCSF Gender Equity Trainee Taskforce Lead (GETTF) & Student Title IX Rep.

GETTF was founded in 2018 following a confidential community breakfast to reflect on a presentation (co-hosted by the Science Policy Group & WILS) of a report on Gender & Sexual Harassment in Academia, Engineering and Medicine released by the directors of NASEM in 2018. To our surprise about 30- 40 people showed up at that breakfast to share their experiences of discrimination and harassment at UCSF. We decided to continue the breakfasts and formed a working group to analyze the NASEM report. We found that there was overlap with UCSF in the 3 broad areas of climate, transparency & hierarchy; over the course of 6 months we interviewed people and examined policy on the UC level, speaking with the Chancellor, Title IX Office administrators; etc. all of which led up to a Town Hall (linked below).

Key Takeaways from Elina:

- My section analyzed transparency and we found that the current policies focused on symbolic legal compliance rather than actual cultural change; and, that change in the climate would require 3 things: community awareness, clear standards of behavior, and accountability.
- Our goal was to achieve a clear demonstration that sexual harassment was not tolerated; to create transparency and community awareness of on-going investigations; as well as to demonstrate that individuals are held accountable. And so we asked for a periodic publication on sexual harassment and misconduct at UCSF, clear Title IX policies, procedures and resources, **and** to add restrictions on mentorship as a possible outcome to safeharbour those communities.
- Thru reflections with the student body we found that students felt outraged and betrayed by PIs insisting they continuously collaborate with a faculty member whom they knew was guilty of Title IX violations; they were upset that the offender was having regular interactions with students, and they wondered if their PI knew, and was subjecting them to that risk anyways, or whether they were unaware; and they were most burdened by the question of *how can I protect other students?*
- Based on a series of interviews we found that faculty and heads of graduate programs weren't even aware of cases of Title IX violations.
- The general sentiment among trainees is that they felt unprotected, unsafe and devalued knowing that these people are present, unacknowledged, and supported by the community; when survivors are not.
- They're collective efforts culminated in a Town Hall where they shared the results of their findings (poster, which has N~264, linked below)

Re: GETTF's response to request from GC for input on proposed changes to By-laws.

EK: In interest of time I'll only touch on some key takeaways; the publically accessible 6 pg. doc is linked below

- One of main recs: is to ensure that reporting happens to Graduate Programs upon completion of the Title IX investigation (after the faculty member has exhausted their appeals process within ~60-90 days of a complaint being filed). While this may seem like a low bar, it's actually critical to include very specific language to avoid delaying reporting over a subsequent period where the case goes to a committee that ultimately decides what sanctions should be handed down, which averages an additional 220 days.
- We request a 72-hr communication period for reporting – which is consistent w/ CPS.
- We request that the 1st people to receive the report are **both** the Chancellor to the Graduate Dean **AND** the Personal Care Advocate; because it's important to create redundancies where the report is not being received by a single individual

- The GC didn't go far enough in adopting our recs, so we are in ongoing discussions with them and I have also linked to our draft letter to them.

Follow these links to find out more about our work – we welcome your participation, GETTF is a non-hierarchical committee that consists of approximately 50 trainees and faculty members who have been working on issues of Gender Equity, Gender Harassment, and Sexual Harassment at UCSF.

<https://careadvocate.ucsf.edu/events/town-hall-gender-equity-and-inclusion>

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CqC5ZzFYncuJkiPi0IFiFGQGyhQ1KYlouHw5G5Fo3hw/edit>

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1L7bxO4BCdlax7pINCBnoHqUcQCxu1HnE0HILCbfh-NY/edit#heading=h.vi00z6je1j7v>

Row 13 continued: **Protocol for escalating and resolving issues (gray areas) utilizing RJ Maria Jaochico**, RJ Campus Lead.

Overview of RJ as both part of a process to repair harm to community as well as a mechanism for a “path back”; where the goal is to lower the risk of repeat behavior. Despite MJ giving examples to flush out what RJ might look like, if it were to play a role in a “path back,” the group didn't show much enthusiasm; instead members voiced lots of concern.

Questions, concerns & comments raised in discussion:

- *When/how do we know that RJ is appropriate in a given situation?*
 - Possibly integrate portions of RJ – ask 4 questions to each party. In MJ's example, removing someone from community doesn't hold perpetrator accountable – only “repairs harm” for “victim.”
- *How do we handle repeat offenders, who continually harm community, – even if the harm they inflict does not rise to policy violation? I.e. how many RJ harms can be perpetuated by the same person?*
 - Via RJ circles parties agree on the outcome.
- ****How do we assuage fear of retribution for individuals that may elect to try RJ; and where is protection for the harmed individual?**
 - RJ alone can't fix this fear; power dynamics does come into play. Success of RJ requires a community cultural change .

Action item – Asterixed item above needs to be addressed

- *My read is that it is not a priority of this TF to ensure a “path back” for Title IX violators who have been permanently removed from grad programs; moreover, we're “not even there yet.”*
 - Maria clarified that RJ can play an important role in repairing harm to community w/o enabling the option of a “path back.” - That it's absolutely complimentary to the TF's rec.; and offers a tool to repair harm to the survivor & community w/o providing a path back for the offender.
- *In alignment with Dyche's notion of “testing the system” - how bout we advocate for rolling out the recommendation that faculty found in violation of FCC be removed from grad programs & mentorship positions, w/o a path back, then wait and see if the lack of a path back (**even**) turns out to be an issue preventing adoption/implementation of rec.*
- *TN: Buy-in from Chancellor's office will be critical in ultimately moving the needle on this and **it will take time!** Meanwhile, if they see a groundswell by various stakeholders pushing the envelope on this as far as they can, within existing constraints, it may ultimately help tip them towards adopting and implementing measures to address community concerns' around increasing transparency in reporting violations, as well as in removing offenders from mentorship positions in order to foster a climate where trainees feel more safe and protected.*

DD invited Denise Caramagno, UCSF Care Advocate, Office of Diversity and Outreach to define and speak on Institutional Betrayal (IB) & on whether we have other evidence-based interventions in addition to RJ?

- IB occurs when an institution's and others' response to a harmed party inflicts additional harm; hence thru the lens of IB a harm to one is a harm to all. For example, even if the harm wasn't egregious, the aftermath may be; in how things get minimized or how some people get marginalized while others are given more voice. Community members may wonder/ask, why isn't my colleague being treated in a manner that is respectful and healing?

Title IX was gutted during the Trump Administration under Betsy DeVos, so for something to constitute a violation of Title IX the behavior has to be **both** severe and pervasive (it used to be severe **or** pervasive) so this eliminates a lot of really egregious behavior; that will need to be addressed outside of a policy violation. It was also changed to only address violations that occur on the physical property of a university/institution.

- The Office of Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD) has "neutral investigators, with integrity" who are charged with conducting investigations of complaints of Titles IX & Title VII violations. They determine a.) Whether a policy violation has occurred and b.) Whether there will be a formal or informal resolution. Both parties have to be in agreement to go the informal resolution route.
 - *A student asked what the recourse is for "gray area" violations that don't rise to level of policy violations and what trauma-informed/survivor-centered ways to address harm we can avail ourselves to.*
 - MJ: an RJ interview; many offices already address violations.
- *EK brought up the notion restorative vs. transformative justice & asked where responsibility lies for implementing transformative justiceif it's even in the scope of UCSF*
 - MJ goes back to re-entry as a flashpoint - if an individual is not permanently removed, then when they return after serving their sanction – what is UCSF's commitment to reintegrating them? Whether or not you like what they did and how it was handled, they are still part of the community.
 - It's Important to temper expectations vis-à-vis RJ: concerns around reporting mandates/compelled disclosures/confidentiality/liability and legal risks can all temper an individuals' willingness to engage in RJ.
- *A student raised concern re: the need to build-in safeguards against potential conflicts of interest in required chain of communication that is intended to increase transparency re: reporting transgressions; and to ensure that this information is disseminated widely.*
 - There was widespread agreement on the need for redundancy as a safeguard.

MJ: on Bias Response Team This model that is being piloted in partnership w/ Grad Div is years in the making. Trained team members will utilize RJ framework to address transgressions & grievances that don't rise to the level of an OPHD investigation; with the goal of repairing both one-on-one harm as well as harm done to the community. Team can help the harmed individual navigate the university's disparate resources by creating a hub of shared resources that trainees can "shop" for in a centralized place; including team-members trained in RJ who can facilitate community circles/harm circles and restorative circles. Ideally they'll manage a central repository to collect data & track "micro-aggressions." Next steps include developing an online presence & intake forms; training more community members in RJ facilitation; and working out a partnership with graduate programs to hash out protocols for addressing transgressions that fall into the gray zone.

Student observation re: TF being lopsided towards Title IX

- *The whole impetus of this TF was to address racial/ethnic harassment, discrimination & disparities; yet it seems singularly focused on sexual harassment. Does OPHD also investigate cases of racial harassment/discrimination?*
 - o *Is it a case of the low hanging fruit? Tackling discussions that are “easier” and more “clear cut” vis-à-vis crossing a line in the sand?*
 - EK: comparing repeated microaggressions to sexual violations; as I’d commented, Title VII was significantly weakened, we’ve had pushback – there is a lot of subjectivity re: who decides what is severe.
 - *Student: Why is it so difficult to word policy in a way that it can be enforced? Why do you assume good faith?*
 - EK: vis-à-vis GC, it has to do with stakeholder interest groups
 - o DC: Yes, same office, same people & same process – OPHD is charged with investigating cases of racial discrimination, but does not determine outcome. I can tell you that Renee Navarro has received funding and is in the process of hiring another OPHD care advocate to help address the recent deluge of racial discrimination cases. Timeline is approx. 6 months.
 - TF should refocus its’ effort on addressing issues of racial discrimination on campus. If you google UCSF Care Advocate, the information only speaks to Title IX. It’s very clear that UCSF has built up the resources around Title IX; yet there is no equivalent visible presence for Title VII. The TF should advocate for a similar office/process/resources to ensure that folks are in compliance Title VII violations & address gray areas

Action item – Recenter ourselves on racial discrimination/Title VII in March mtg.

Next meeting, end of February – Jennifer will send out Doodle to schedule